

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
Before the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences

Applicant : Howard T. Marano
Serial No. : 10/007,370
Filed : February 19, 2002
For : Method, Apparatus, System And User Interface For Scheduling Tasks

Examiner : Beth Van Doren
Art Unit : 3623

REPLY BRIEF

May It Please The Honorable Board:

This is Appellant's Reply Brief in response to the Examiner's answer dated October 9, 2007. No fee for filing this Reply Brief is believed due. Should a fee be due please charge this fee to Deposit Account No. 19-2179. Appellants waive an Oral Hearing for this appeal.

Please charge any additional fee or credit any overpayment to the above-identified Deposit Account. Enclosed is a single copy of the Brief.

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest of Application Serial No. 10/007,370 is the Assignee of record:

Siemens Medical Solutions Health Services Corporation
51 Valley Stream Parkway
Malvern, PA 19355-1406

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are currently, and have been, no related Appeals or Interferences regarding Application Serial No. 10/007,370.

III. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-19 are rejected and the rejection of claims 1-19 is appealed.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

All amendments were entered and are reflected in the claims included in Appendix I.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The Summary of the Claimed Subject Matter provided in the Appeal Brief filed on June 19, 2007 is incorporated herein by reference and Applicant respectfully submits that no further summary is needed.

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Claims 1-11 and 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Srimuang (U.S. 2003/0061087).

Claims 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srimuang (U.S. 2003/0061087) in view of Mayhak, Jr., et al. (U.S. 2001/0051888).

VII. ARGUMENT

For the reasons presented in the Appeal Brief filed on June 19, 2007, which are incorporated herein by reference, and for the following reasons, Srimuang, when taken alone or in any combination with Mayhak, Jr. does not make the present claimed invention unpatentable. Thus, reversal of the Final Rejection (hereinafter termed “rejection”) of claims 1-11 and 14-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and claims 12-13 under section 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 1-11 and 14-19 under 35 USC 102(e) over Srimuang (U.S. 2003/0061087)

Srimuang does not anticipate claims 1-11 and 14-19. Thus, reversal of the Final Rejection (hereinafter termed “rejection”) of claims 1-11 and 14-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is respectfully requested.

The arguments below address the Examiner’s Answer dated October 9, 2007 (“Answer”) and are supplemental to the Appeal Brief filed in this case. The Arguments in the previous Appeal Brief are fully pertinent and are to be considered in conjunction with the following arguments.

CLAIMS 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8 – 11, and 15 - 19

Srimuang fails to disclose or suggest the features of “interface menu supporting user entry of decision information for initiating execution of at least one executable procedure for automatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks and assigning an identifier representing a selected task to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities in response to received information identifying an event” as recited in claim 1 of the present claimed invention.

The Answer asserts that the system of Srimuang allows a customer to use a user

interface to enter information identifying an event. The user entered decision information identifying an event causes the system to execute a procedure that automatically identifies tasks associated with the entered event and tasks associated with an employee and/or resources. The system then automatically checks the availability of these schedules and places a selected task on the schedule of a selected entity (employee or resource). See Answer, Pages 13 and 14. Applicant respectfully submits that the Answer has misinterpreted Srimuang and the present claimed invention. Specifically, the system of Srimuang merely allows a user to schedule a service, and then identifies employees who are available to perform the service. The user then selects an available employee who may be the preferred employee that the user desires to perform the selected service. Alternatively, a user is able to select from a list of available employees other than the preferred employee (See Srimuang, Figure 11, S1 – S4; Figure 12, S50 – S54; Figure 13, S100 – S104 and Figure 14). Therefore, contrary to the assertions by the Answer, the system of Srimuang merely schedule services or appointments that are **manually** selected **by a user**. The system only identifies the employees who are available to perform the selected service. Then one of the available employees is selected and confirmed **by a user**. This is wholly unlike the present claimed invention which provides **automatic** task selection and assignment that significantly improves hospital personnel and resource allocation, planning and operation. Thus, Srimuang does not disclose or suggest an “interface menu supporting user entry of decision information for initiating execution of at least one executable procedure for automatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks and assigning an identifier representing a selected task to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities in response to received information identifying an event” as recited in claim 1 of the present claimed invention.

The Answer on Page 14 further asserts that Srimuang in paragraphs 80, 81, and 109 that discloses a service request is used to automatically schedule tasks for a combination of people and resources using a unitary request. However, the cited portions of Srimuang merely describes that when a service request is entered by a user, the types of employees qualified to perform the service are identified and the availability of the

employees is determined. Based on the availability reported back, it's further determined whether the appointment of service can be scheduled. However, neither the cited portions nor elsewhere in Srimuang disclose automatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks and assigning an identifier representing a selected task to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities as in the present claimed invention. Furthermore, while the system of Srimuang determines the availability of employees, Srimuang does not automatically place a selected task on the schedule of a selected employee as asserted by the Answer. In fact, Srimuang states that "[T]he doctor's office may have more than one doctor and/or more than one nurse – [and] in this case, availability for all the doctors and all the nurses may be determined (see Paragraph 0109)". Upon determining employee availability, one of the available employees is selected and confirmed by a user (See Srimuang, Figure 11, S1-S3; Figure 13, S100 – S104; and Figure 14). This is wholly unlike the present claimed invention which provides **automatic** task selection and assignment. Thus, Srimuang does not disclose or suggest "interface menu supporting user entry of decision information for initiating execution of at least one executable procedure for automatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks and assigning an identifier representing a selected task to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities in response to received information identifying an event" as recited in claim 1 of the present claimed invention.

Furthermore, the Answer contends that Srimuang discloses that a service request event is automatically broken down into a series of tasks that are assigned to various resources or people. The Answer then concludes that the Srimuang system automatically checks the availability of the employee schedules and, if available, places a selected task on the schedule of a selected entity. As discussed above, while the system of Srimuang determines the availability of employees, Srimuang does not automatically places a selected task on the schedule of a selected employee as asserted by the Answer. In Figure 14 provides a user interface display image 270 which specifically requires a user of Srimuang, to manually select and confirm one of the available employees to perform

the service. Unlike the present claimed invention, Srimuang is not concerned with **automatic** task selection and assignment. Thus, Srimuang does not disclose or suggest “interface menu supporting user entry of decision information for initiating execution of at least one executable procedure for automatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks and assigning an identifier representing a selected task to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities in response to received information identifying an event” as recited in claim 1 of the present claimed invention. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 102(e) is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 4, 6, 7 and 19 are dependent on claim 1 and are considered to be patentable for the reasons given above and in the Appeal Brief. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3, 4, 6, 7 and 19 under USC 102(e) is respectfully requested.

The remarks above are also applicable to Independent claims 8 and 15 – 18. Therefore, claims 8 and 15 – 18 are considered patentable for the additional reasons described above. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8 and 15 - 18 under USC 102(e) is respectfully requested.

Claims 9-11 are dependent on claim 8 and are considered to be patentable for the reasons given above and in the Appeal Brief in connection with claim 8. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9-11 under USC 102(e) is respectfully requested.

CLAIM 2

Claim 2 is dependent on claim 1 and is considered to be patentable for the reasons given above and in the Appeal Brief with respect to claim 1. Claim 2 is also considered to be patentable because Srimuang neither discloses nor suggests “initiating execution of at least one executable procedure to automatically select said particular task schedule from said plurality of displayable task schedules, in response to said received information identifying an event and wherein the step of initiating display of the at least one interface menu includes initiating display of menu elements prompting a user to identify at least

one of (a) the predetermined event triggering application of the decision information in assigning the task representative identifier to the task schedule, (b) a source of the decision information, (c) decision information for initiating execution of at least one executable procedure for identifying a task schedule for listing the task representative identifier” as recited in the present claimed invention. As described above, Srimuang is a manually driven system. Srimuang merely allows a user to **manually** select an available time slot when booking an appointment, such as a hair appointment or an oil change appointment. The passages cited in the Office Action for claim 2 are the same passages cited with regard to claim 1. Nowhere in these passages or elsewhere in Srimuang is there any 35 USC 112 enabling disclosure describing “initiating execution of at least one executable procedure to **automatically** select said particular task schedule from said plurality of displayable task schedules, in response to said received information identifying an event” as recited in claim 2 of the present invention. Srimuang merely allows for manual selection of individual time slots for a task and is not at all concerned with automatic selection of particular **task schedules from said plurality of displayable task schedules**. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 2 is respectfully requested.

CLAIM 5

Claim 5 is dependent on claim 1 and is considered to be patentable for the reasons given above and in the Appeal Brief in connection with claim 1. Claim 5 is also considered to be patentable because Srimuang neither discloses nor suggests “said decision information initiates execution of said at least one executable procedure to automatically and programmatically without user intervention select said task and assign said identifier, in response to received information identifying an event and the entity comprises at least one of (a) a category of users, (b) one or more users currently designated to perform a healthcare worker role and (c) a medical device or system” as recited in the present claimed invention. The Answer contends that, in paragraph 109, Srimuang describes a system that is able to automatically schedule a combination of worker and resources because the definition of specific services are programmed into the software identifying the rules that govern who and what is required for the service. The

Answer then concludes that the system is able to schedule the tasks needed without user intervention. However, as discussed above, the cited portion of Srimuang merely describes that when a service request is entered by a user, the types of employees qualified to perform the service are identified and the availability of the employees is determined. Based on the availability reported back, it's further determined whether the appointment of service can be scheduled. In Figure 14 of Srimuang, the display image 270 includes a selection box which asks the user to **manually** select and confirm one of the available employees to perform the service. Unlike the present claimed invention, Srimuang is not concerned with **automatic** task selection and assignment. As described above with respect to claim 1, Srimuang is merely a manually driven resource scheduler. As such, Srimuang fails to provide any suggestion of the combination of features of claims 1 and 5. Specifically, Srimuang neither discloses nor suggests "at least one executable procedure to **automatically and programmatically without user intervention** select said task and assign said identifier" as recited in the present claimed invention. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 5 under 35 USC 102(e) is respectfully requested.

CLAIM 14

Claim 14 is dependent on claim 8 and is considered to be patentable for the reasons given above and in the Appeal Brief in connection with claim 8. Claim 14 is also considered to be patentable because Srimuang neither discloses nor suggests "wherein said at least one executable procedure removes a task representative identifier from the task schedule associated with the particular entity in response to occurrence of a triggering event" as recited in the present claimed invention. The Answer asserts that Srimuang, in paragraphs 31, 45, 65, 80, 81 and 108 discloses that when automatic scheduling of tasks occur and a proposed task is to be added, a conflict may cause revisions to the schedule based on priority. Specifically, tasks are removed from the calendar automatically based on revision procedures to resolve the conflict. However,

contrary to the assertion by the Answer, the cited portion merely describes detection of a schedule conflict with a preferred employee and requiring the user to revise the scheduling of the service with an alternate employee. Applicant respectfully submits that manually scheduling a service with a second-choice resource because the first-choice resource presents a conflict is not equivalent to “said at least one executable procedure removes a task representative identifier from the task schedule associated with the particular entity in response to occurrence of a triggering event” as recited in the present claimed invention. Removal of task identifiers is not discussed or mentioned anywhere in the cited reference. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 14 under 35 USC 102(e) is respectfully requested.

In view of the above remarks and amendments to the claims, it is respectfully submitted that there is no 35 USC 112 enabling disclosure in Srimuang that anticipates the present claimed invention. Thus, in view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-11 and 14-19 not anticipated by Srimuang. It is thus further respectfully submitted that this rejection is satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 12 and 13 under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srimuang (U.S. 2003/0061087) in view of Mayhak, Jr. et al. (U.S. 2001/0051888).

The arguments below address the Examiner’s Answer dated October 9, 2007 (“Answer”) and are supplemental to the Appeal Brief filed in this case. The Arguments in the previous Appeal Brief are fully pertinent and are to be considered in conjunction with the following arguments.

CLAIM 12

These remarks respond to the Examiner’s Answer and supplement the remarks contained in the Appeal Brief filed on June 19, 2007. Claim 12 is dependent on claim 8 and is considered to be patentable for the reasons given above and in the Appeal Brief

with respect to claim 8. Specifically, Mayhak (with Srimuang) fails to disclose or suggest that “said at least one executable procedure conditions allocation of the task to the task schedule associated with the particular entity upon coincidence of a plurality of occurrences” and “further including acquiring data to identify the coincidence of the plurality of occurrences” as recited in claim 12 of the present invention.

The Answer asserts in Page 17 that, as described in paragraphs 0010-0012, 0040-0042, 0065, 0068, 0071 and 0076 of Mayhak, the occurrences of profiles of employee and patient and patient, type and timing of appointment, deleting and modification to the schedule, job type etc. are equivalent to the claimed executable procedure which conditions allocation of the task to the task schedule associated with the particular entity upon coincidence of a plurality of occurrences as in the present invention. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The above mentioned data is merely user entered information for generating a schedule. However, neither the cited portion nor elsewhere in Mayhak (with Srimuang) is concerned with selecting a task being based “upon coincidence of a plurality of occurrences and...data to identify the coincidence of the plurality of occurrences” as required in the present invention. The reference also fails to show or suggest “acquiring data to **identify the coincidence** of the plurality of occurrences.” The cited reference passages simply do not show or suggest such features and the Answer fails to make any showing that specifically identifies where such a combination of features are present.

Furthermore, the Answer on Page 17 contends that *KSR* “forecloses the argument that a specific teaching, suggestion, or motivation is required to support a finding of obviousness”. However, as stated in *KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1734, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1391 (2007), the question of obviousness is resolved on the basis of underlying factual determinations including (1) the scope and content of the prior art, (2) any differences between the claimed subject matter and the prior art, (3) the level of skill in the art. *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 17-18, 148 USPQ 459, 467 (1966). Moreover, the Court explained, “[o]ften, it will be necessary for a court to look to interrelated teachings of multiple patents; the effects of demands known to the design

community or present in the marketplace; and the background knowledge possessed by a person having ordinary skill in the art, all in order to determine whether there was an apparent reason to combine the known elements in the fashion claimed by the patent at issue.” Id. at 1740-41, 82 USPQ2d at 1396. The Court noted that “[t]o facilitate review, this analysis should be made explicit. Id. (citing *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977, 988, 78 USPQ2d 1329, 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2006)) “[R]ejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness”. Applicant respectfully submits that the Answer fails to satisfy the burden required in *KSR* because the determination of obviousness made throughout the rejection amounts to conclusory statements which are not sufficient to support the conclusion of obviousness. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 12 under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

CLAIM 13

These remarks respond to the Examiner’s Answer and supplement the remarks contained in the Appeal Brief filed on June 19, 2007. Claim 13 is dependent on claim 8 and is considered to be patentable for the reasons given above and in the Appeal Brief with respect to claim 8. Specifically, Mayhak (with Srimuang) fails to disclose or suggest that “a. the triggering event is conditioned upon coincidence of a plurality of occurrences, and b. further including acquiring data to identify the coincidence of the plurality of occurrences” as recited in claim 13 of the present invention.

The Answer asserts in Page 17 that, as described in paragraphs 0010-0012, 0040-0042, 0065, 0068, 0071 and 0076 of Mayhak, the entering of profile information and patients’ schedules causes the triggering of a procedure that generates employee schedules is equivalent to the claimed triggering event which is conditioned upon coincidence of a plurality of occurrences as in the present invention. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The cited portion of Mayhak merely describes a scheduling system based on user entered information such as job types, employee information and patient information. However, neither the cited portion nor elsewhere in Mayhak (with

Srimuang) is concerned with “assigning” tasks “in response to occurrence of the triggering event” and specifically in response to “coincidence of a plurality of occurrences.” The reference also fails to show or suggest “acquiring data to **identify the coincidence** of the plurality of occurrences.” The cited reference passages simply do not show or suggest such features and the Rejection fails to make any showing that specifically identifies where such a combination of features are present.

Furthermore, the Answer on Page 17 contends that *KSR* “forecloses the argument that a specific teaching, suggestion, or motivation is required to support a finding of obviousness”. However, as stated in *KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1734, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1391 (2007), the question of obviousness is resolved on the basis of underlying factual determinations including (1) the scope and content of the prior art, (2) any differences between the claimed subject matter and the prior art, (3) the level of skill in the art. *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 17-18, 148 USPQ 459, 467 (1966). Moreover, the Court explained, “[o]ften, it will be necessary for a court to look to interrelated teachings of multiple patents; the effects of demands known to the design community or present in the marketplace; and the background knowledge possessed by a person having ordinary skill in the art, all in order to determine whether there was an apparent reason to combine the known elements in the fashion claimed by the patent at issue.” *Id.* at 1740-41, 82 USPQ2d at 1396. The Court noted that “[t]o facilitate review, this analysis should be made explicit. *Id.* (citing *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977, 988, 78 USPQ2d 1329, 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2006)) “[R]jections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness”. Applicant respectfully submits that the Answer fails to satisfy the burden required in *KSR* because the determination of obviousness made throughout the rejection amounts to conclusory statements which are not sufficient to support the conclusion of obviousness. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 13 under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1-19 should be reversed. In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that Srimuang and Mayhak, Jr., when taken alone or in combination, provide no 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure that makes dependent claims 1-19 unpatentable. Therefore, Applicant further respectfully submits that this rejection has been satisfied and should be withdrawn.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Srimuang and Mayhak, Jr., when taken alone or in any combination, neither disclose nor suggest automatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks as in the present claimed invention. Specifically, Srimuang and Mayhak, Jr., when taken alone or in any combination also neither disclose nor suggest assigning a task representative identifier representing a selected task to be performed by a particular entity as in the present claimed invention. Additionally, Srimuang and Mayhak, Jr., neither disclose nor suggest automatically initiating execution of at least one executable procedure to select a selected task schedule from a plurality of displayable task schedules and assign the task representative identifier representing a task to be performed by a particular entity as in the present claimed invention. Accordingly it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1 – 19 be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,



Alexander J. Burke
Reg. No. 40,425

Date: December 7, 2007

Alexander J. Burke
Intellection Property Department
Siemens Corporation,
Customer No. 28524

Tel. 732 321 3023
Fax 732 321 3030

APPENDIX I – APPEALED CLAIMS

1. (Previously Presented) A method for assigning an identifier to at least one of a plurality of displayable task schedules, comprising the activities of:

- a. initiating display of at least one interface menu supporting user entry of decision information for initiating execution of at least one executable procedure for automatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks and assigning an identifier representing a selected task to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities, in response to received information identifying an event, said particular task schedule being associated with a particular entity of said corresponding plurality of different entities;
- b. receiving decision information entered via said at least one interface menu; and
- c. applying the received decision information and initiating execution of said at least one executable procedure, in response to received information identifying an event, to automatically select a task from a plurality of different tasks and assign a task representative identifier representing a selected task to be performed by said particular entity, to said task schedule associated with said particular entity.

2. (Previously Presented) A method according to claim 1, including the activity of

initiating execution of at least one executable procedure to automatically select said particular task schedule from said plurality of displayable task schedules, in response to said received information identifying an event and wherein

the step of initiating display of the at least one interface menu includes initiating display of menu elements prompting a user to identify at least one of (a) the predetermined event triggering application of the decision information in assigning the task representative identifier to the task schedule, (b) a source of the decision

information, (c) decision information for initiating execution of at least one executable procedure for identifying a task schedule for listing the task representative identifier.

3. (Previously Presented) A method according to claim 1, wherein

the decision information initiates execution of at least one logical procedure for processing data associated with a task to identify a task schedule for incorporating the task representative identifier.

4. (Original) A method according to claim 3, wherein

the data associated with a task comprises at least one of (a) a medical procedure identifier for a scheduled procedure, (b) a time and date of performance of a medical procedure, (c) patient medical record information, (d) location of performance of a medical procedure, (e) patient type identifier and (f) patient physical characteristics.

5. (Previously Presented) A method according to claim 1, wherein

said decision information initiates execution of said at least one executable procedure to automatically and programmatically without user intervention select said task and assign said identifier, in response to received information identifying an event and

the entity comprises at least one of (a) a category of users, (b) one or more users currently designated to perform a healthcare worker role and (c) a medical device or system.

6. (Original) A method according to claim 1, wherein:

- a. the decision information identifies the predetermined event and
- b. the predetermined event corresponds to at least one of (a) patient

admission, (b) beginning of a medical procedure, (c) end of a medical procedure and (d) a user defined event based on information acquired.

7. (Previously Presented) A method according to claim 1,

wherein said received decision information initiates execution of said at least one executable procedure to prioritize a plurality of task representative identifiers of a task schedule associated with a particular entity in response to occurrence of a triggering event.

8. (Previously Presented) A method for assigning an identifier to at least one of a plurality of task schedules, comprising the activities of:

- a. initiating display of at least one interface menu supporting user entry of decision information for assigning a task representative identifier to a selected task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities, said selected task schedule being associated with a particular entity of said corresponding plurality of different entities and accessible by the particular entity, the decision information including data identifying:
 - i. at least one executable procedure for processing data associated with a task to select a task schedule for incorporating the task representative identifier and for assigning said task representative identifier representing a task to be performed by said particular entity, to said selected task schedule, and
 - ii. an event for triggering application of said at least one executable procedure;
- b. receiving decision information entered via the at least one interface menu;
and
- c. automatically initiating execution of said at least one executable procedure to select said selected task schedule from said plurality of displayable task

schedules and assign said task representative identifier representing a task to be performed by said particular entity, to said selected task schedule, in response to received information identifying occurrence of a triggering event.

9. (Previously Presented) A method according to claim 8, wherein

said at least one interface menu supports user entry of decision information including said data identifying said at least one executable procedure for automatically and programmatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks and assigning an identifier representing a selected task to said selected task schedule of said plurality of displayable task schedules, in response to received information identifying an event and

the data associated with a task comprises at least one of (a) a medical procedure identifier for a scheduled procedure, (b) a time and date of performance of a medical procedure, (c) patient medical record information, (d) location of performance of a medical procedure, (e) patient type identifier and (f) patient physical characteristics.

10. (Original) A method according to claim 8, wherein

the triggering event corresponds to at least one of (a) patient admission, (b) beginning of a medical procedure, (c) end of a medical procedure and (d) a user defined event based on acquired information.

11. (Original) A method according to claim 8 further including acquiring the data associated with a task.

12. (Previously Presented) A method according to claim 8, wherein

a. said at least one executable procedure conditions allocation of the task to

the task schedule associated with the particular entity upon coincidence of a plurality of occurrences, and

b. further including acquiring data to identify the coincidence of the plurality of occurrences.

13. (Previously Presented) A method according to claim 8, wherein

a. the triggering event is conditioned upon coincidence of a plurality of occurrences, and

b. further including acquiring data to identify the coincidence of the plurality of occurrences.

14. (Previously Presented) A method according to claim 8,

wherein said at least one executable procedure removes a task representative identifier from the task schedule associated with the particular entity in response to occurrence of a triggering event.

15. (Previously Presented) A method for providing a user interface for assigning an identifier to at least one of a plurality of displayable task schedules comprising the activities of:

a. in response to a user command,

i. initiating display of at least one interface menu supporting user entry of decision information for initiating execution of at least one executable procedure for automatically and programmatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks and assigning an identifier representing a selected task to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities, in response to received information identifying an event, said particular task schedule being associated with a particular entity of said corresponding

plurality of different entities; and

- ii. initiating display of an updated task schedule including said selected task having said assigned identifier associated with the particular entity, in response to received information identifying an event.

16. (Previously Presented) A method for providing a user interface supporting assigning an identifier to at least one of a plurality of task schedules comprising the activities of:

- a. in response to a user command,
 - i. initiating display of at least one interface menu supporting user entry of decision information for automatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks and assigning an identifier representing a selected task to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities, in response to received information identifying an event, said particular task schedule being accessible by the particular entity, the decision information including data identifying,
 - ii. at least one executable procedure for processing data associated with a task to identify a task schedule for incorporating the task representative identifier and for assigning said task representative identifier representing a task to be performed by said particular entity, to said particular task schedule, and
 - iii. an event for triggering application of said at least one executable procedure; and
- b. initiating display of an updated task schedule associated with the particular entity, the updated task schedule being generated in response to received information identifying a triggering event initiating execution of said at least one executable procedure to automatically assign said task representative identifier representing a task to be performed by said particular entity, to said task schedule associated with said particular

entity.

17. (Previously Presented) A method for assigning an identifier to at least one of a plurality of task schedules comprising the activities of:

- a. initiating display of at least one interface menu supporting user entry of decision information for selectively assigning a task representative identifier to at least one of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities, said at least one of a said plurality of displayable task schedules being associated with a respective one of said corresponding plurality of different entities, the decision information including data identifying:
 - i. at least one executable procedure for processing data associated with a task to identify a task schedule for incorporating the task representative identifier and for assigning said task representative identifier representing a task to be performed by said particular entity, to said particular task schedule, and
 - ii. an event for triggering application of said at least one executable procedure;
- b. receiving decision information entered via the at least one interface menu;
and
- c. automatically initiating execution of said at least one executable procedure to select a particular task schedule from said plurality of displayable task schedules

and to automatically selectively assign said task representative identifier representing a task to be performed by said respective one of said corresponding plurality of different entities, to said at least one of the plurality of task schedules associated with said corresponding plurality of different entities, in response to occurrence of the triggering event.

18. (Previously Presented) A system for assigning an identifier to at least one of a plurality of displayable task schedules comprising:

- a. a display processor for initiating display of at least one interface menu supporting user entry of decision information for initiating execution of at least one executable procedure for automatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks and assigning an identifier representing a selected task to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities, in response to received information identifying an event, said particular task schedule being associated with a particular entity of said corresponding plurality of different entities; and
- b. an interface processor for receiving decision information entered via the at least one interface menu and for automatically initiating execution of said at least one executable procedure, in response to received information identifying occurrence of an event to automatically select a task from a plurality of different tasks and automatically assign a task representative identifier representing a selected task to be performed by said particular entity, to said task schedule associated with said particular entity.

19. (Original) A computer program embodied within a computer-readable medium created using the method of claim 1.